



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/770,386	02/04/2004	Steven M. Bessette	4380-153	1902

23117 7590 12/22/2004
NIXON & VANDERHYE, PC
1100 N GLEBE ROAD
8TH FLOOR
ARLINGTON, VA 22201-4714

EXAMINER

LEITH, PATRICIA A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1654

DATE MAILED: 12/22/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary**Application No.**

10/770,386

Applicant(s)

BESSETTE ET AL.

Examiner

Patricia Leith

Art Unit

1654

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 October 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 15-42 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 20-28 and 34-42 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 15-19 and 29-33 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 04 February 2004 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>2/27/04</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 15-42 are pending in the application.

Applicant's election without traverse of the species of eugenol and forskolin in the reply filed on 10/21/04 is acknowledged.

Because claims 20-28 and 34-42 are solely directed toward the non-elected species, these claims are hereby withdrawn from consideration on the merits.

Claims 15-19 and 29-33 were examined on the merits.

Information Disclosure Statement

The information disclosure statement filed 2/27/04 fails in part to comply with 37 CFR 1.98(a)(2), which requires a legible copy of each U.S. and foreign patent; each publication or that portion which caused it to be listed; and all other information or that portion which caused it to be listed. In the Instant case, Applicant states that some or all of the references listed on the PTO-1449 can be found in the parent case 09/455, 543. However, the references which have been crossed-through on the 1449 form are not found in '543 and therefore the information referred to therein has not been considered. It is further noted that the French patent 2,706,771 is not accompanied by

any relevant translation. Finally, the German patent DE3829200 should be placed under 'Foreign Patent Documents' instead of 'Other Documents' as listed by Applicant. This patent abstract has been considered and will be signed when re-submitted in the correct format.

Drawings

The drawings are objected to because Figures 2-56 contain bar graphs and keys which are not clearly distinguishable. Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. The replacement sheet(s) should be labeled "Replacement Sheet" in the page header (as per 37 CFR 1.84(c)) so as not to obstruct any portion of the drawing figures. If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 15 -19 and 29-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for a method for treating breast cancer with forskolin along with eugenol, does not reasonably provide enablement for the treatment of any type of cancer with any combination of forskolin and plant essential oil compound as listed in claim 31 for example. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims.

The factors to be considered in determining whether undue experimentation is required are summarized in *re Wands* 858 F.2d 731, 8 USPQ2d 1400 (Fed. Cir, 1988). The court in *Wands* states: "Enablement is not precluded by the necessity for some experimentation such as routine screening. However, experimentation needed to practice the invention must not be undue experimentation. The key word is 'undue,' not 'experimentation.'" (*Wands*, 8 USPQ2d 1404). Clearly, enablement of a claimed invention cannot be predicated on the basis of quantity of experimentation required to

make or use the invention. "Whether undue experimentation is needed is not a single, simple factual determination, but rather is a conclusion reached by weighing many factual considerations." (Wands, 8 USPQ2d 1404). The factors to be considered in determining whether undue experimentation is required include: (1) the quantity of experimentation necessary, (2) the amount or direction or guidance presented, (3) the presence or absence of working examples, (4) the nature of the invention, (5) the state of the prior art, (6) the relative skill of those in the art, (7) the predictability or unpredictability of the art, and (8) the breadth of the claims. While all of these factors are considered, a sufficient amount for a *prima facie* case are discussed below.

It would be highly unpredictable to ascertain whether the composition of the present invention could treat any type of cancer. It is known in the art that cancer treatment is a rare and unpredictable phenomenon. Bally et al. (US 5,595,756) for example, stated, "Despite enormous investments of financial and human resources, no cure exists for a variety of diseases. For example, cancer remains one of the major causes of death. A number of bioactive agents have been found, to varying degrees, to be effective against tumor cells. However, the clinical use of such antitumor agents has been highly compromised because of treatment-limiting toxicities" (Col.1 lines 17-24).

It is noted that there is *not a single example in the Instant specification*, working or prophetic, which indicates that the product of the Instant disclosure would perform beneficially on any type of cancer except for breast cancer. Further, there is no indication that any type of essential oil compound would act beneficially on breast

Art Unit: 1654

cancer or any other type of cancer. Since there are **no** working examples, then one must consider the guidance provided by the instant specification and the prior art of record.

The state of the art is unpredictable as it reflects that there is no cure for cancer and cancer treatments are rare (Bally et al. *supra*). Inventions targeted for cancer treatment bear a heavy responsibility to provide supporting evidence because of the unpredictability in biological responses to therapeutic treatments. The standard of enablement is higher for such inventions because as the state of the art stands, there is no 'prevention' or 'cure' for cancer ('756) and cancer treatments are rare. There is no conclusive evidence in the Instant disclosure which indicates that the composition, as Instantly claimed would work *in-vivo* or even *in-vitro* with regard to all cancers such as lung, rectal or blood cancers (as examples).

For the efficacy of a drug treatment *in vivo* faces unfavorable obstacles not present in *in vitro* models. As such, *in vivo* utility necessarily involves unpredictability with respect to physiological activity of an asserted process in humans. See discussion in Ex parte Kranz, 19 USPQ 2d 1216, 1218-1219 (6/90). For examples, drug delivery to the target area must survive the acidic environment of the stomach if administered orally. Additionally, the delivery of the drug across necessary cell surfaces in amounts needed to be efficacious, but not lethal to the subject, necessitates sensitive testing in order to adequately determine the proper human dosage. In the Instant case, Applicant

has not provided any indication that the composition of the Instant claims would work even relatively *in-vitro* on any cancer besides breast cancer. Further, it is noted that not all cancers metastasize analogously to MCF-7 cells; One such cancer is leukemia.

The high degree of unpredictability associated with the claimed method underscores the need to provide teachings in the specification that would provide the skilled artisan with specific treatment regimens that achieve a therapeutic benefit by *in vivo* or *ex vivo* therapy; however, the specification does not provide such guidance. Without such guidance in the specification and the lack of correlative working examples, to use the Invention as Instantly claimed would require an undue amount of experimentation without a predictable degree of success on the part of the skilled artisan.

In re Fisher, 427 F.2d 833, 166 USPQ 18 (CCPA 1970), held that

"Inventor should be allowed to dominate future patentable inventions of others where those inventions were based in some way on his teachings, since such improvements while unobvious from his teachings, are still within his contribution, since improvement was made possible by his work; **however, he must not be permitted to achieve this dominance by claims which are insufficiently supported and, hence, not in compliance with first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112**; that paragraph requires that scope of claims must bear a reasonable correlation to scope of enablement provided by

Art Unit: 1654

specification to persons of ordinary skill in the art; in cases involving predictable factors, such as mechanical or electrical elements, a single embodiment provides broad enablement in the sense that, once imagined, other embodiments can be made without difficulty and their performance characteristics predicted by resort to known scientific law; in cases involving unpredictable factors, such as most chemical reactions and physiological activity, scope of enablement varies inversely with degree of unpredictability of factors involved." (Emphasis added)

Thus, it would require undue trial and error experimentation, without a reasonable expectation of success for the skilled artisan to use the product of the Instant disclosure to treat any cancers besides breast cancer for the reasons set forth *supra*.

No Claims are allowed.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Patricia Leith whose telephone number is (571) 272-0968. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30am-5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Bruce Campell can be reached on (571) 272-0974. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 1654

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Patricia Leith
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1654

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read 'Patricia Leith', is written over the printed name and title.

12/17/04